

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

---

YURIY Y. KRASNOV, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	CASE NO. 1:14-CV-2364
Plaintiffs,	:	
vs.	:	OPINION & ORDER
RBS CITIZENS, N.A.,	:	[Resolving Doc. No. <a href="#">10</a> ]
Defendant.	:	
	:	

---

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

The *pro se* plaintiffs have filed an “Emergency Motion” in this case to stay proceedings to enforce a state-court judgment issued on December 1, 2014 in *RBS Citizens, N.A. v. Yuriy Krasnov, et al.*, Case No. 742261 (Cuyahoga Cty. Court of Common Pleas) while this case is pending. (Doc. No. 10.) The December 1, 2014 state-court judgment the plaintiffs seek to stay is a decree by the Ohio court confirming the sale of real property sold pursuant to the court’s prior judgment of foreclosure.

Federal courts lack subject-matter jurisdiction to review claims of injury to plaintiffs caused by state-court judgments under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Givens v. Homecomings Financial*, 278 Fed. App’x 607, 2008 WL 2121008, at \*1 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. May 20, 2008). Accordingly, this Court will not interfere with the state court’s December 1, 2014 judgment. The plaintiffs’

emergency motion “to stay” the state-court’s December 1, 2014 judgment is, therefore, denied.<sup>1</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 10, 2014

s/ *James S. Gwin*  
JAMES S. GWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup>The defendants have filed a motion to dismiss the plaintiffs’ entire complaint in this case on the basis of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. (See Doc. No. 7.) The Court will consider the defendants’ motion to dismiss in a subsequent order. At this juncture, the plaintiff’s emergency motion to stay is denied.